

Chair:
Councillor Clare Kober

Deputy Chair:
Councillor Lorna Reith

INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report covers matters considered by the Cabinet at our meeting on 17 November 2009. For ease of reference the Report is divided into the Cabinet portfolios.
- 1.2 We trust that this report will be helpful to Members in their representative role and facilitate a fruitful dialogue between the Cabinet and all groups of Councillors. These reports are a welcome opportunity for the Cabinet on a regular basis to present the priorities and achievements of the Cabinet to Council colleagues for consideration and comment. The Cabinet values and encourages the input of fellow members.

ITEMS OF REPORT

Children and Young People

2. CHILDREN'S CENTRES – PHASE 3 REVIEW

- 2.1 We considered a report on the development of Haringey's Phase 3 children's centre programme and were pleased to note that this was well under way. The positive feedback received from the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) about our plans, reflected the confidence in our ability to deliver to expectations. Given the strong performance of the Council through the development of the first two phases, and the work that had been undertaken to establish the rationale for our Phase 3 programme, there was scope to provide sufficient access to services through the realisation of our Phase 3 plans.
- 2.2 At the time of our meeting feed back was awaited from the DCSF on *Sure Start, Early Years and Childcare* Grant funding arrangements post March 2011. Information on future funding arrangements was expected during the period April 2010 – March 2011.
- 2.3 The report to the Executive in 2007 on "*Developing Sustainable Childcare*" noted a review was to be undertaken of funded nursery places with the intention of identifying new models for supporting our most vulnerable children to access, good quality early years provision and we were informed that the Children and Young People's Service was now in a position to consider the provision of funded places through the children's centre programme as part of this wider strategic context.
- 2.4 We were also informed that the advent of a new single funding formula from April 2010 for the provision of the free, flexible nursery education entitlement for all 3 and 4 year olds would provide us with the opportunity to address inconsistencies in how the free entitlement offer was currently funded across the private, voluntary, independent and maintained sectors (including children's centres).
- 2.5 We report that we noted the plans for capital investment to meet the DCSF target of delivering two new designated children's centres by March 2010 and that additional plans were in place to deliver universal access to children's centre services for children under 5

living in Haringey by March 2011. We also noted the continued strategic development of children's centres and centres services as the Council progressed towards the mainstream delivery of integrated early childhood services from April 2010.

- 2.6 We agreed to receive a report setting out a sustainability strategy for children's centre services following an announcement from the DCSF on future funding arrangements for early years and children's centres as well as a report in June 2010 following a review of the fee charging arrangements and funding for childcare places, including targeted provision for disadvantaged and vulnerable children in Haringey.

Housing

3. SUPPORTED HOUSING REVIEW

- 3.1 We considered a report which provided us with an update on the review of supported housing and sought our approval of a plan for addressing the specific needs of 4 sheltered housing schemes, increasing the provision of 'extra care' housing and enabling all of the Council's supported housing to be brought up to the decent homes standard.
- 3.2 We also received a deputation from the Association of Tenants Representatives who addressed our meeting and spoke about proposals to remove elderly tenants from sheltered housing schemes in the borough and the determination of those tenants to remain in their homes. They asked that the issue be looked at again to ensure that every effort was made to find a solution that did not require people to move.
- 3.3 We responded to the deputation and having conceded that one disadvantage of the current proposals if adopted was that some older people would be asked to live in a different place we emphasised our concern that any changes be handled sensitively and noted that to this end a number of informal briefings had been held to which the families of residents of sheltered housing schemes had been invited. We re-iterated that the Council valued older residents and there were good neighbour schemes and sheltered housing schemes which provided supported housing for older people.
- 3.4 We were informed that although 25 of the Council's sheltered housing schemes had already been included in the decent homes programme, 4 schemes (Campbell Court, Larkspur Close, Protheroe House and Stokley Court) had been the subject of an options appraisal. These four schemes were chosen because they were unsuitable for supported housing, did not have modern facilities or needed a large investment to bring them up to the decent homes standard.
- 3.5 In reviewing the future of the 4 schemes, we were seeking to improve the quality of supported housing, increase the supply of 'extra care' housing in the borough, provide residents with more choice in how their housing and support needs were met, and help older people to remain independent.
- 3.6 In August 2009, the Housing Quality Network (HQN) completed an assessment of the different options for each scheme. The HQN appraisal set out detailed cost estimates of the various options, including an 'optimum' solution that would involve the closure of all four schemes, the conversion of Campbell Court to 'general needs' housing, the redevelopment of Protheroe House as 'extra care' supported housing, the disposal of

Larkspur Close and the redevelopment of Stokley Court as social rented housing. However, although we were recommended to approve the redevelopment of Protheroe House as 'extra care' supported housing, it was **not** recommended that Campbell Court be converted to 'general needs' housing or, at this stage, that Larkspur Close be disposed of or that Stokley Court be redeveloped as social rented housing.

- 3.7 We noted that the proposals contained in the report were intended to help to promote sustainable communities by providing older people with greater choice in their housing, housing-related support and social care. 'Extra care' supported housing was under-provided in Haringey, and this severely limited the choices and life chances of particularly vulnerable older people who might find themselves restricted to residential care options.
- 3.8 We also noted that any proposals to decommission sheltered housing schemes and to transfer tenants to alternative accommodation would be matters that fell within the requirement on the Council to consult with secure tenants on housing management matters which were likely to affect them. The consultation arrangements would allow the tenants to make their views known within a specified period and the Council had to take those views into consideration before making a final decision on the matter. Although the residents of the four schemes had received a number of informal briefings on the progress of the Supported Housing Review and the options appraisal, no formal consultation had yet taken place. We further noted that most residents attending the briefings had expressed understandable concern and anxiety at the prospect of moving from their home and some had wanted to know whether there was scope for them to remain within a friendship group if they needed to transfer to alternative supported housing.
- 3.9 We were informed that while the views of the residents would be taken into account before a final decision was made, the Council also had to have regard to wider considerations including the need for the shortage of extra care housing to be addressed and the availability of Council and Government capital funding. The views of the tenants at Campbell Court had been taken into account and it was now being recommended that it be retained as a sheltered housing scheme and included in the decent homes programme.
- 3.10 It having been confirmed that although the four schemes had been included in the original decent homes bid the HQN report had set out detailed cost estimates of the various options and had concluded that it was not viable to bring them up to the decent homes standard we agreed that the key outcomes of the Supported Housing Review be noted and granted approval in principle to the following recommendations in relation to the four sheltered housing schemes:
- That Campbell Court be maintained as a sheltered housing scheme and included within Haringey's decent homes programme;
 - That, subject to formal consultation with the tenants and completion of a detailed financial appraisal, Protheroe House be closed and the site redeveloped as a mixed tenure 'extra care' supported housing scheme;

- That Larkspur Close continue as a sheltered housing scheme but not be included in the decent homes programme until completion of a comprehensive options appraisal and financial assessment, including the feasibility and cost of completing remedial works converting Larkspur Close to a 'good neighbour' scheme and redeveloping the site and pending a decision being made on its future use.
- That Stokley Court continue as a sheltered housing scheme but will not yet be included in the decent homes programme until December 2010 when a decision will be made on its future use.
- That formal consultation take place with the residents of Protheroe House on the future of their homes, and that the results of that consultation and the Equalities Impact Assessment be reported back to a future meeting.
- That, with immediate effect and until further notice, properties that become vacant at Protheroe House must not be re-let.

Enforcement and Safer Communities

4. OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION ON THE REVISION OF THE STATEMENT OF GAMBLING POLICY

- 4.1 We reported on this matter to the Council meeting on 30 November 2009.

Adults, Culture and Community Services

5. MEMBER'S PANEL – SAFEGUARDING ADULTS

- 5.1 We noted that the Independence, Well-being and Choice Service Inspection in January 2009, had suggested that aspects of performance monitoring needed to be further enhanced and we considered a report which proposed that a Member level body be established to provide additional overview and scrutiny of the safeguarding of vulnerable adults.
- 5.2 We report that we appointed the Adult Safeguarding Advisory Committee with the following membership, quorum and terms of reference -

Membership

3 Councillors, 2 from the Majority Group and 1 from Opposition
(Chair to be nominated by Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Well Being).

(Quorum 2 Members)

Terms of Reference

- To examine and review the effectiveness of the Council's policies and practice in relation to the Safeguarding of Adults (Adult Protection);

- To review and examine the effectiveness of arrangements for cooperation; and joint working of Adults Safeguarding issues between partner agencies;
- By obtaining the views of key stakeholders (staff, families/carers and the person themselves) to obtain a qualitative understanding of how safeguarding processes were working to protect vulnerable adults;
- To consider the Council's policies and performance in relation to safeguarding adults through observing practice within Haringey; and
- To make recommendations on these issues to the Cabinet, the Lead Member for Adult Social Care and Wellbeing and the Assistant Director for Safeguarding in order to take forward and drive improvements to safeguarding adults within the borough.

These terms of reference to be reviewed by the Lead Member for Adults Social Care and Well Being at least every two years. Administrative support for the Panel to be provided by the ACCS Safeguarding Team's Business Support Officer.

Resources

6. FINANCIAL PLANNING 2010/11 – 2012/13

- 6.1 The Council will be aware that the integrated financial and business planning process is the key mechanism by which our plans and strategies are reviewed to ensure the performance and priorities are being met and that resources are allocated effectively to underpin their achievement. The process culminates in changes to the budget and medium term financial strategy that delivers a revised Council Plan. The Plan reflects the Council's own priorities and contributes to the wider Sustainable Community Strategy delivered in conjunction with the Haringey Strategic Partnership.
- 6.2 We considered a report which advised us that the prospects for future local government grant settlements were that there would be a severe constraint in public spending given the current recession and the public borrowing requirement. The budget for 2010/11 was the third year of the three year settlement following the last comprehensive spending review in 2007 and it was not expected that the grant position would change significantly. The significant impact was expected the following year, in 2011/12. At the time of our meeting the Chancellor was expected to produce a pre-budget report which was likely to set out the new spending limits across the public sector and give an indication of the level of contraction of funding in overall terms. The more detailed Government spending plans were likely to follow in 2010.
- 6.3 We reported to the Council on 19 October on our financial strategy for the period 2010/11 to 2012/13 and advised that we had agreed a business planning and budget-setting process. At that time an overall net additional savings target of nearly £23 million was reported over the full three year planning period. This assumed the achievement of pre-agreed savings proposals of nearly £15 million in the first two years. The budget for 2010/11 was the last one for the current administration and three year spending period and this showed a savings target requirement of £2 million subject to any additional growth pressures and investment requirement. In terms of resources for next year the

grant settlement figure was the final one of the three year agreement with an increase of 1.5%.

- 6.4 The previous planning assumptions for Council Tax were increases of 3.0% in each year but this was varied last year (2009/10) with an increase of 1.95%. The budget plans were now being prepared on the basis of aiming for a Council Tax freeze for 2010/11 and this planning assumption was built in to the projections reported to us. We report that we noted the update on financial planning issues and we agreed that the pre-business plan reviews, including the investment and savings options, be released for consultation and the scrutiny process.

Leader

7. NDC SUCCESSION ARRANGEMENTS

- 7.1 We considered a report which advised us that there was a legal requirement that we approve the New Deal for Communities succession and legacy arrangements in order to ensure that the successful outcomes be sustained beyond the end of the programme in 2011 in line with Government requirements. The report proposed the succession and legacy arrangements for the Bridge New Deal for Communities (NDC) beyond March 2011 which included the setting up of a company limited by guarantee with charitable status as a successor body.
- 7.2 Our approval was also sought to proposals for Asset/Funding support for the Bridge Renewal Trust and to the NDC succession arrangements ahead of the required submission to the Department of Communities and Local Government by 27 November 2009.
- 7.3 We report that we approved the succession and legacy arrangements as recommended noting that they would be subject to approval by the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) and Government Office for London (GOL) before any claw back on the NDC grants was removed. We also noted that the new entity was to be called The Bridge Renewal Trust ("the Trust").
- 7.4 We also agreed to the assignment of the Council's sub under lease of part of the Laurels Healthy Living Centre to the Trust and we approved the following
- a. The payment of the annual rent received under the Under lease currently equivalent to £285,000 annual rent to the Trust for a period of 10 years as detailed in paragraph 7.3.6. of the interleaved report on the understanding that this rental income from the Laurels Healthy Living Centre might go up or down as it was subject to 5 yearly rent reviews and would be used by the Trust to meet the rent, proportional maintenance costs, insurance and service charges and other charges under the Sub Under lease, the remainder of the rental income to provide core funding for the successor body and ensure it developed into a viable and sustainable charitable organisation.
 - b. A one-off grant funding from the unspent Laurels income to the Trust subject to CLG approval of the NDC succession strategies and the provision of a robust and viable business plan for the successor body.

- c. Any future repayments of the £1.5 million (plus any interest) interim Gap Funding paid back under the Development Agreement dated 2 August 2007 for the Wards Corner redevelopment being ring fenced in a special Council escrow account and used to address housing needs in the NDC area, the Council to ensure that both the Trust and CLG were consulted on the use of the funds;
 - d. Any future repayments arising out of the Wards Corner overage arrangements being ring fenced in the Council escrow account and used to address housing needs in the NDC area.
- 7.5 Further that, in line with Government requirements, to an assurance being given that all the assets funded wholly or substantially through NDC grant including the Laurels Healthy Living Centre, Triangle Children's Centre and St Ann's Library Hall which were owned by the Council would continue to be used to benefit NDC area residents into the long term. Approval was also granted to the Council entering into a Funding Agreement with the Bridge Renewal Trust to give effect to 6.4a and 6.4b above and to the delegation of authority to sign off of the final Funding Agreement between the Council and the Trust to the Director of Urban Environment in consultation with the Leader of the Council. We noted that the Council had been invited to nominate two representatives to serve as Trustees on the Board of the Trust.

8. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

- 8.1 We considered a report which set out the Council's project plan for the delivery of the Haringey Local Development Framework (LDF). The programme for the delivery of a suite of planning policy had been amended to reflect the work programme and the need to review other documents that should be also be prepared.
- 8.2 We noted that the Council was required to review its Local Development Scheme (LDS) regularly if changes to the project Plan for preparing planning policy document were envisaged. We reported to the Council on 20 July on a set of emerging new planning policy documents which could be included in the revised LDS. As a result of consultation with statutory bodies on the LDS and also on the Core Strategy Preferred Options, and because of the lack of agreement for future directions on Central Leaside Area Action Plan with Enfield Council, further changes had become necessary for the LDS which was to be submitted to the Greater London Authority (GLA) and the Government Office for London (GoL) for their approval.
- 8.3 In accordance with PPS12 Local Spatial Planning, the LDS would be the projects management document within the Haringey Local Development Framework that also aligned with the priorities identified in Haringey's Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS). The LDS would seek to contribute to achieving the vision in the SCS which was 'a place for diverse communities that people are proud to belong to' by ensuring that the Council could provide a planning policy framework to deliver this vision.
- 8.4 We report that we approved the submission of the Haringey Local Development Scheme be submitted to the GLA and to GoL for approval and we agreed that any amendments which needed to be made to the Local Development Scheme document be approved by

the Director of Urban Environment in consultation with the Leader of the Council before finalising the Local Development Scheme for submission. Following submission to and the receipt of comments from the GLA and GoL, the Director in consultation with the Leader be authorised to make any further amendments to the LDS prior to submission to the Secretary of State.

9. APPOINTMENT OF COUNCILLOR TO SERVE ON THE HORNSEY TOWN HALL COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP BOARD

- 9.1 We noted that Councillor Cooke had resigned as one of our representatives on the Hornsey Town Hall Community Partnership Board and we report for information that we appointed Councillor Joe Goldberg to serve in his place.

10. THE COUNCIL'S PERFORMANCE: SEPTEMBER 2009 (PERIOD 6 – QUARTER 2)

- 10.1 We considered a report which presented on an exception basis financial and performance information for the year to September 2009, asked us to agree proposed budget virements in accordance with financial regulations and provided us with an update on progress against current Council Plan actions for the year to the end of September 2009.
- 10.2 We noted that overall performance on the monthly and quarterly basket of indicators showed that of the 90 indicators with values comparable to current targets, 47% were on target with a further 21% close to target and 32% not currently achieving target. The report provided some key messages on performance for the year to September 2009 including an update on progress against Haringey's Local Area Agreement. An Appendix served as exception report for areas where targets were not being achieved and detailed an explanation of the performance and actions being taken to meet or move closer to the agreed levels of service. A table of contents is available at the front to signpost the page for each exception indicator.
- 10.3 With regard to the Council Plan update, Directorates were asked to provide an update every quarter of progress against actions in their Directorate Plans that formed the 2009 -10 Council Plan. Of 155 actions in the Council Plan, 28 were now reported as complete and 98 were on target. Minor issues were reported for 26 actions. Three actions reported major issues that were likely to affect the ability to complete the action by the agreed target date. At the time of our meeting updates were still awaited for the remaining 13 actions and these were being chased by the Policy and Performance Division.
- 10.4 The overall revenue budget monitoring, based on the September position, showed a forecast gross spend of £4.4 million above budget. This was partially off set by a £1 million contribution from the general contingency and a reduced call on the inflation budget of £1.5 million following the settlement of the pay award at a lower sum than planned. This resulted in a net forecast of £1.9 million above budget. The position was to be closely monitored during the remainder of the financial year as Directors continued to implement measures to reduce costs wherever possible.

10.5 The aggregate capital projected position in 2009/10 was to under spend by £18.7 million (9%) which related to Adults, Culture and Community Services (£3.4 million), Children and Young People’s Service (£7.1 million), Corporate Resources (£6.6 million) and Urban Environment (£1.6 million). A significant proportion of the 2009/10 capital programme was funded by the generation of capital receipts from the Council’s disposal programme. The target level of receipts assumed for this financial year is £9.1 million. The latest forecast of in year receipts as at period 6 had been revised slightly upwards to £4.33 million. The overall shortfall was mainly as a result of very difficult property market conditions currently prevailing and impacting on valuations and hence the deferral of some disposals into later years. We noted that it was proposed to partly mitigate the shortfall by the use of brought forward Department of Children Schools and Families non-ring fenced capital funding of £2.283 million offered by the Government in 2009/10 to help maintain the capital programme at existing levels. This would be repaid to the Children & Young Peoples Service capital programme in 2012/13 in line with the needs of that programme. Other options, including restricting expenditure on some capital receipts funded projects, were currently being explored as well as assessment of whether there was any slippage on existing schemes that might assist in balancing resources this year. The position was being kept under constant review and updates included in future reports.

10.6 Under the Constitution, certain virements are key decisions. Key decisions are:

- For revenue, any virement which results in change in a directorate cash limit of more than £250,000; and
- For capital, any virement which results in the change of a programme area of more than £250,000.

Key decisions are highlighted by an asterisk in the table.

10.7 The following table sets out the proposed changes. There are two figures shown in each line of the table. The first amount column relates to changes in the current year’s budgets and the second to changes in future years’ budgets (full year). Differences between the two occur when, for example, the budget variation required relates to an immediate but not ongoing need or where the variation takes effect for a part of the current year but will be in effect for the whole of future years. Proposed virements are set out in the following table –

Revenue Virements						
a	b	c	d	e	f	g
Period	Service	Key	Amount current year (£'000)	Full year Amount (£'000)	Reason for budget changes	Description
P7	AC	Rev	198	198	Budget Realignment	Realignment of Day Care Budgets.
P7	AC	Rev*	497		Budget Realignment	Transfer of the carers grant from the Commissioning and Strategy Business Unit to Adult Services Business Unit
P7	AC	Rev	162	166	Budget Realignment	Transfer of the Policy Team from the Commissioning and Strategy Business Unit to Adult Services Business Unit.
P7	AC	Rev	139	139	Budget Realignment	Virement to correct allocations of pre agreed savings.

P7	AC	Rev*	589	589	Budget Realignment	Allocation of savings from improved commissioning and brokerage to appropriate budget heads.
P7	AC	Rev*	322	322	Budget Realignment	Allocation of Mental Health capacity grant to appropriate budget heads
P7	AC	Rev*	1,897		Allocation of Grant Funding	Allocation of 2 nd half year ABG grant allocations to appropriate budget heads.
P7	AC	Rev*	287	287	Budget Realignment	Account maintenance – transfer of budgets from a closing cost centre to new cost centre.
P7	UE	Rev*	576		Allocation of Grant Funding	Virement following confirmation of grant funding from North London Strategic Alliance and London Development Agency
P7	CY	Rev*	7,261		Allocation of Grant Funding	2009/10 Area Based Grant Childrens Trust 2nd half year allocation
P7	CY	Rev*	513	513	Allocation of Grant Funding	The virement reflects increases in both grant and associated expenditure codes following notification of increased grant allocations.
P7	CY	Rev	(224)		Allocation of Grant Funding	Reduction in Early Years grant to reflect lower actual pupil numbers
P7	CY	Rev*	592		Allocation of Grant Funding	Virement to reflect increase in Standard Funds allocations as a result of finalised pupil numbers.
P7	CY	Rev*	800		Budget Realignment	Virement to reallocate CYPs resources to supplement the LAC Commissioning budget.
P7	CY	Rev*	896		Budget Realignment	Allocation of Area Based Grant to Business Units
P7	HC01	Rev*	1,569	1,569	Budget Realignment	Allocation of pay inflation (1% & 1.25%) to reflect the Greater London Provincial Council agreement.
Capital Virements						
Period	Service	Key	Amount current year (£'000)	Full year Amount (£'000)	Reason for budget changes	Description
6	CR	Cap*	(1,500)		Re-phasing	Since the creation of the IT Prioritisation Board, only projects with a fully developed business cases have been approved and funding released. This ensures that only appropriate projects are funded but has had an implication for the timing of spend. This virement re-profiles £1.5m into 2010/11 to fund projects that have been agreed but will not spend until the new year.
6	CR	Cap*	(4,405)		Re-phasing	The current budget is based on an historical spend profile. Following the report to Cabinet in July and formation of a new programme board to manage the project, spend profiles have been reviewed and the project budget therefore requires re-phasing.

11. DELEGATED DECISIONS AND SIGNIFICANT ACTIONS

11.1 We were informed of the following significant action taken by a Director under delegated powers -

Director of Adult, Culture and Community Services

Safeguarding and Strategic Services – Finance Service Establishment Changes.

Adult Services – Integrated Access Team Establishment Changes

Adult Services – 100 Whitehall Street Establishment Changes

Director of Children & Young People's Services

Muswell House (Children's Home) – Establishment Changes

Breakfast Clubs – Approval of New Funding and Monitoring Arrangements (October 2009 – March 2011)

Participation Team – Establishment Change (Recruitment to Posts) on cessation of an external contract for a Children’s Rights Service.

BSF – Northumberland Park School – Supply and Installation of Fixed Furniture

Framework Agreement for Grocery, Consumables and Frozen Foods

Muswell Hill Youth Centre – Electrical and Building Works

BSF – Highgate Wood School FF&E Vocal Equipment to New Specialist Areas and Hall

Director of Corporate Resources

Childcare Litigation Services – Extension of 3 months to the Contract with Islington Council for the provision of child care legal services